



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MODERN ITALY AND PIUS X

PROFESSOR WALTHER KÖHLER

Giessen, Germany

“Fair art thou, with stars in thy hair, which gleam like glittering sapphires, and sweet thy breath, O rosy messenger of day. With the smile of satisfied yearning thou callest aloud from the rocks that the paradise of Italy is forever freed from the yoke.” Thus sang the Italian poet, Gabriel Rossetti, of the dawn of liberty which seemed to greet his country in 1820. “Fair art thou, with stars in thy hair!” Indeed, it is almost as if the kiss of the dawn had imprinted its own beauty on the paradise of Italy. Something of the rosy glow of dawn, a wonderful play of color, of sunny gleams of light, lies across the valleys of Italy. Its very name is a word to conjure with. Like magic it summons up a thousand images. They emerge from the gray past, the spirits of the imperial glory of Rome. The ruins of Rome are once more peopled with life. On the Forum we see the crowd demanding its rights; in the Circus Maximus the people thirsting for the blood of the martyrs; and in the mystic darkness of the Catacombs the little band of Christians preparing their grave in the rocks. From the ashes and lava of Pompeii an entire city rises, as if its inhabitants had but now left it. The bread just baked still lies in the oven; we see the tools in the shops, the walls still ornamented with their glowing frescoes. Again, as the antique world vanishes, imagination sees mediaeval life flourish, end, and pass into modern life in the Renaissance. The golden age of art, of painting, sculpture, and poetry, opens its gates to us in Italy. Dante, the marvelous painter of heaven and hell; Petrarca, equally great as a man of learning and a man of feeling; Giotto, with his simple portrayal of the life of St. Francis of Assisi, so true to life and so pathetic; della Robbia, with his lovely frescoes; Michael Angelo, with the titanic force of his brush and chisel—they all have wrought here. And finally the entire age of the Renaissance seems to concentrate itself in the Florence of the Medici. Then again, in the long mantle and slouch hat of the traveler, Goethe appears before us in Italy, drawing new force

from the springs of antique life after the exhausting court life at Weimar. Though later he drew back in anger from the "brutalized nation," yet he left us that sweet maiden figure which calls us with the harp, and longs for Italy. The song of Mignon has become the song of desire for all who do not yet know that beautiful land. It calls up the images of antiquity and of the Renaissance, and it adds the modern charms—the typical figures of the people, the bronzed men with their straw-braided bottles of Chianti, the women with lustrous eyes and gay head-dress, the charming children in their sweet unconstraint; or the glories of Venice, with its lagoons, its gondoliers, and the doves of S. Marco; or an evening on the Corso at Rome, where carriages roll by with the glances and greetings of fair women. All this and more is contained in the name of Italy. The very word is full of dreams; of a *dolce far niente* that would steal the seriousness from life.

But this sunny Italy is not to be the object of our study. Not antiquity, nor Renaissance, nor the Italy of the modern tourist, but the concrete modern Italian state is to come before us from the point of view of political history; the Italian state as it has come to be and as it now is. The one cannot be understood without the other; for only he that knows the past comprehends the present.

The modern kingdom of Italy dates back to September 20, 1870, the day on which Rome became the capital of Italy. The exact historian would run back nine years farther and fix on March 17, 1861, as the day when the kingdom of Italy entered the family of nations. The road which led to this goal was strange and tortuous, perhaps even more devious than that which led to a united Germany in 1871.

At the end of the eighteenth century the map of Italy was checkered with a mass of states and statelets. There were the kingdom of Sardinia, with its main constituents of Savoy and Piedmont; Lombardy, with Milan, in the possession of Austria; the republic of Venice, asleep on her ancient laurels, but still of more importance than her sister-republic of Genoa; the two duchies of Parma and Modena; the grand-duchy of Tuscany, the heritage of the Medici in Florence; the miniature republic of Lucca; then the great territory of the Papal State, with the legations of Bologna, Romagna,

and Ferrara—a state with two and a half million inhabitants ruled by the *Papa-Ré*, the papal king; still larger, embracing six million inhabitants, the kingdom of Naples and Sicily, ruled by the dynasty of the Bourbons. A mass of trivial states, with the typical symptoms of decay! In the republics a feudal nobility; in the monarchies princes who tried to drape their personal insignificance with the glamour of external splendor and the claims of absolutism; bigoted religion hand in glove with lust—figures such as Guiseppe Verdi has painted for us in his *Rigoletto*; *le roi s'amuse*, dancing through life with a step as light as the music of Verdi, but trampling on the holiest emotions of his court-jester. Neither monarchies nor republics recognized any higher task or aim; wherever an attempt was made in that direction, a relapse quickly followed.

But there came a sudden awakening when the tempest of the French Revolution swept over Italy. For the first time modern France thundered at the gates of Italy, and since then the fortunes of the two countries were bound together until Italian unity was complete. No other country owes so much to France as Italy. Its influence first came with the blast of a storm, but it was the useful storm which breaks away the old and rotten branches, and makes place for the sprouting of new life. Under the strong hand of Napoleon the little states of Italy crumbled and broke. A superior intellect now guided the figures on the political chess-board, and finally established new French states on the wrecks of the old. Even the pope bowed before the all-powerful Frenchman. But when Napoleon fell, his proud edifice fell with him. Yet he left behind him ineffaceable traces, the spiritual heritage of the French Revolution in that purified form which the great Corsican had given it. When we speak of the French Revolution, we are apt to think only of the scenes of terror, the execution of the king, and the blood of the citizens, and to forget that the Reign of Terror was only an episode, in which a vast force, newly unleashed, overleaped itself. Viewed in its larger connection with the evolution of civilization, the French Revolution is a magnificent unfettering of the spirit, in which ideas that had slowly been maturing were hurled among the people as by a volcanic eruption. The theories of learned radicals and the schemes of practical politicians fused with immense effectiveness. The third estate, the citizen and

peasant, so long despised, rose from their submerged powerlessness and advanced to the forefront of political life. Those who had formerly been good enough to drive out from the ponds the frogs that robbed the *grand seigneur* of his sleep now swung the scythe of death before the thrones of kings. In the French Revolution the people seized their political rights. The absolute monarchy by the grace of God was doomed. The natural rights which had long been the political theory of a philosophical school became the basis of a political system. Royal power was not eternal in its nature; it had grown, and what hands had built up, other hands could tear down. Kings are not irresponsible; the people can hold them to account and guard their own interests. The state of the future is the constitutional state built on the joint action of prince and popular legislature. But this was only one aspect of the great revolutionary programme: "Liberty, Fraternity, Equality." Equality of citizens before the law and equal rights for all implied the abolition of special privileges for special religious bodies. It meant a state neutral toward the religion of its citizens. That again implied freedom of science, freedom of public utterance and of the press; in short, an injection of democracy into a society which had hitherto been feudal and aristocratic.

This spiritual heritage, so infinitely rich and varied in its possible application, was left behind on the Italian peninsula after the French occupation. It worked like a fiery draught setting the blood of the people on fire, even though—or, rather, just because—a leaden pressure had long rested on the body politic. As everywhere else, the reactionary forces got control when Napoleon fell. The Congress of Vienna placed the peninsula under Austrian administration. Lombardy and Venetia became Austrian possessions. Parma and Piacenza were handed over to Marie Louise, the Austrian wife of Napoleon I. Modena also received an Austrian ruler. In the other countries the old dynasties were restored. The petty states had returned. Soon the Austrian premier could coin the contemptuous phrase: "Italy is only a geographical idea." From a superficial point of view that was true; but in the depths new forces were fermenting. The spirit of the French Revolution was at work. Under Napoleon's empire men had seen all Italy controlled by a single hand, even though Napoleon had bestowed the various terri-

tories among his relatives. For a short time there had been a united kingdom of Italy which embraced Lombardy, Venetia, Modena, the Romagna, and the Marches in a single state, and the blessings of such unity had been felt in a great uplift of commerce and industry, of agriculture and the arts. The Papal State had disappeared, and men had found that the pope and his secular rule were not inseparable. Property in the dead hand of the church had been confiscated, and men had seen it turn into productive capital in the hands of industrious citizens. Men had breathed in deep draughts the free air of French equality. All this was progress; reaction could overturn it, but could not overcome it. Driven out of public political life, it turned into secret paths and created the political clubs which, under the pressure of constant persecution, intensified the ideas of liberty to deeds of violence and murder. Even today Italy is the nursery of secret societies. They grew up during that time. The leaders of *Italia sotteranea* were the Carbonari, possibly an off-shoot of the Free Masons, with their black, red, and blue tricolor, who fought especially in Naples and Sicily for "God, King, and Constitution." Later there was a society which bore the proud name *Giovane Italia*, "Young Italy." Its founder, Giuseppe Mazzini, called himself simply but significantly "an Italian." Other societies followed, whose names have not been preserved in history. They were all precursors of the terrible Camorra and the Mafia, which today by dark deeds of assassination are fighting the very state which was then the object of desire. The more aristocratic Nationalists held off from this form of agitation, and either were sullenly silent or confined their efforts to literature; not the newspaper press, which was under strict police control, but the treatise or the novel. These years of reaction exhibit a remarkable productivity in books which sought to solve the problem of Italian unity. They were all one in seeking as the ultimate goal a united Italy, however they might differ in detail. D'Azeglio, Grossi, Manzoni, Balbo, Colletta, Tommaseo, wrote their novels during these years. At the beginning of the forties the abbé Vincenzo Gioberti, while in exile at Brussels, published his celebrated book *Il primato morale e civile degli Italiani* ("The Moral and Civil Primacy of the Italians"), which in enthusiastic language prophesied a federation of Italian states under the leadership of the

pope. A party calling itself the New-Guelphs, in allusion to the mediaeval struggles between Guelphs and Ghibellines, adopted this as its programme. One year later Cesare Balbo wrote his book *Le speranze d'Italia* ("The Hopes of Italy"). He too hoped for a federation of states, but under the leadership of Charles Albert, the king of Sardinia. Another again wanted to create a kind of political trinity, a unity of three: in the north, Sardinia, and Piedmont; in the south, the Bourbons; in the middle, the pope. These thinkers were joined by poets who had the gift of uttering what they and their people were suffering. Niccolini in his tragedy called to life the popular hero of liberty in the Middle Ages, Arnold of Brescia. Giuseppe Giusti, scourging the tyrants in the spirit of the Carbonari, pleaded for liberty. Silvio Pellico glorified martyrdom. Giovanni Berchet sang of the Italian colors; they had first appeared in northern Italy in 1797: "Green is the hope which we have cherished for years; Red is the joy that moves us to tears; and White is the faith of fraternal love." The masters of music were nobly inspired by patriotism. Bellini, director at the Scala in Milan, composed his *I Capuleti ed i Montecchi* and his *Norma*. Rossini chose Schiller's glorious drama of freedom, *Wilhelm Tell*, as his musical theme. All these voices in harmony created public opinion—that indefinable force which is ever operative and ever elusive. Formerly it had played the rôle of the court-jester at whose sharp quips his Serene Highness could smile because they were harmless. Now, since the emancipation of the people by the French Revolution, it had become a power which none neglected with impunity.

The period of reaction lasted to the year 1848 in Italy, just as in Germany and France. Small insurrections, flaring up swiftly and suppressed with equal swiftness, were like the lightning flashes before the coming tempest. When the storm broke for France in February, and for Prussia and Austria in March, 1848, Italy too was swept into the revolutionary current. The hour of liberty seemed to have come. North and South rallied to arms, and the thrones of the reactionaries were tottering.

The leader of the Italian movement for unity was the Pope Pius Nono, Pius IX; Giovanni Mastai Ferretti was his family name. Since 1846 he sat on the throne of Peter, a charming and attractive

personality with many jovial and good-natured traits. He had read the *Primato* of Gioberti and the *Speranze d'Italia* of Balbo. Now he seemed called by destiny to realize the dreams of Gioberti. His reign began with a general amnesty for political criminals. This was followed by the appointment of a reform commission. Plans were made for the construction of railways. The pope even promised a constitutional government by the organization of a Council of State to be composed of twenty-four lay councilors—the first time that the laity were to be represented in the administration of the Papal State. And finally his plans reached their climax in the scheme of a dual chamber, checked by the College of Cardinals as Senate. Constitutional government and political liberty had arrived. With ever-increasing jubilation the people of Italy received these royal gifts. In its impulsive fashion the Roman people hurried from feast to feast. Flags fluttered, songs resounded on the streets and in the churches, and the Italians poured out all the hope and enthusiasm of their hearts in the joyous shout: "*Evviva Pio Nono!*" Whenever the pope appeared in the streets, that was the shout of triumph and acclaim about him. It was the watchword of all who hoped for the unity of Italy; for the joy of Rome ran like a contagion over the entire country. Perhaps no pope has ever been so popular. The parties seemed united. Even the revolutionist Mazzini trusted in the voice of Rome. Italy and its pope seemed to be one flock and one shepherd.

Then came the frost in the May night. The inevitable happened. Popular liberty and the papacy were incompatible. The rosy and glittering soap-bubble of Italian unity under the leadership of Pius IX burst. The pope had not realized what would be the outcome of his own actions. He had imagined it to be very easy to cater pleasantly to the people: there would be an amnesty and railroads, and the rest would be easy. In naïve simplicity he had never comprehended the tremendous and holy determination of a people demanding its constitution. Now he woke with sudden terror; after his first grants and concessions the people demanded more and more; a number of political clubs were organized; political newspapers began to appear, as if the liberty of the press were in full operation. Pius had not granted liberty of the press, and had no intention of granting it. He

still rocked pleasantly for a while on the tide of popularity, but the new constitution immediately opened up new difficulties. Even the papal sovereignty was attacked. In view of this dangerous clamor, the pope disavowed his own ministers. When his last hope for the hour of need, the former French ambassador Pellegrino Rossi, was assassinated on the steps of the parliamentary building, November 15, 1848, the bonfires indeed blazed once more because the terrified pope had summoned a democratic cabinet, but the torches were snuffed out when the pope fled from the city in the night of November 24, and now from the safe asylum of Gaeta repealed his entire work and—what was far worse—summoned the Catholic powers to help him to return. They were only too glad to come—Austria at the head, pleased once more to assume the rôle of the policeman clubbing the fair sinner, Italy. France followed under Louis Napoleon, whom the Revolution had made president of the French Republic. Thus began French intervention in Italy, so pregnant with consequences. The dream of Gioberti was ended. The papacy was not the savior of Italy. Under the protection of French and Austrian bayonets, Pius IX returned to Rome April 12, 1850. The republic which had been constituted by the people in his absence, with Mazzini at the head, had to yield to the old authorities; and now reaction ruled.

Pius IX in Italy and Frederick William IV in Prussia played the same rôle, in 1848. Both were romanticists on royal thrones. Both wanted to unite monarchy and democracy. The ride of the king with black-red-gold sash through the streets of Berlin is the counterpart of the rejoicing about Pius IX. Both made a swift turn—the king more disgracefully than the pope, for Prussian grenadiers were more dependable than the papal guards. Both were disavowed by their nation. The angry rattle of the swords of the Prussian officers in the marble hall of the Potsdam palace was the counterpart of the jeering laugh of the Roman people, which greeted the pope on his return with "*Evviva Pio?*" and answered "*No, no!*" But the pope was greater than the king. Out of the reaction he built up a temple of faith, in which he himself could sit enthroned as the Infallible. Pius IX became the pope of the Vatican.

The defeat of liberty in the Papal State was a defeat of the movement for Italian unity generally. All those in north and south who

had rallied to arms had to bow to the yoke of Austria or of their sovereigns. One of the last to sheath his sword was Giuseppe Garibaldi, a young sailor of Nizza.

But now out of the darkest night of quenched hopes slowly arose the wondrous star of Savoy. The revolution of 1848 had buried one scheme for unity; another now appeared. The rôle of leadership, formerly assigned to the pope, now seemed to fall to Charles Albert, the master of Piedmont. And he seized it with a spirit different from that of the pope, with steadfast determination to carry his cause to victory.

Charles Albert of Savoy, born 1798, had early aroused the attention of those who aspired to liberty among the Carbonari. He had been in Paris and had breathed the air of equality in France. It was even asserted that he had himself been a member of the party of the Carbonari. When he ascended the throne in 1831, Mazzini addressed a wonderful patriotic letter to him. He assigned to him a creative rôle, and bade him, like God, create a world out of chaos; to unite the scattered members of the nation, and to say: 'All Italy is mine, and all is happy. Then thou wouldst be great, like God the Creator, and twenty million men would cry: 'God is in heaven, and Charles Albert on earth.''' And the hopes of his people continued to center in him, even if they did not understand all his political actions in his shrewd tacking between reaction and progress. They called him *Re Tentenna*, the see-saw king. When the revolutionary year of 1848 came, it seemed as if he would be able to fulfil all the wishes of his people of Piedmont. Gioberti at that time published his book *Il Gesuita moderno*, a terrible scourging of the Jesuit order and of "the swallows of the Jesuits," as the Ladies of the Sacred Heart were called. He demanded the banishment of these parasites—the creation of a militia, and a constitution. Charles Albert granted this, and, what was more, he preserved these rights for his people, even when the war with Austria, which had been begun like a triumphal march under the leadership of the king, and had been resumed in 1849, when the allies of the previous year, Venice, Lombardy, and even Sicily, were already prostrate, ended in failure. The war had been begun with immense enthusiasm. The king himself had waved the Italian tricolor to the people from the balcony of his palace at

Turin, and had decorated the troops with the arms of Savoy and the tricolor. It was in vain. Enthusiasm begins wars; but victory is decided by military efficiency, and Austria was superior in that. On the field of Novara, Radetzky defeated the Italians. The noble-hearted king paid the price. He took the blame for the war upon himself and resigned in favor of his son, Victor Emmanuel. The son carried on the task in the spirit of his father, and thus Savoy remained at the head of the Italian movement for unity. Gioberti's plan had come to nothing; the plan which centered in Savoy had not. It had only been checked. The newly appointed premier, Massimo d'Azeglio, said: "We shall begin again and do better." The young king, twenty-nine years of age, issued a proclamation safe-guarding the liberties of the country. In spite of the demands of Austria, he had resolutely refused to displace the tricolor, the symbol of unity, by the old flag of Savoy.

Thus the order of the day remained *Avanti Savoya!* "Piedmont will never make peace with Austria; it has only entered on a ten-years' truce." It was necessary to keep the peace without in order to concentrate all forces within. This task was clearly grasped in Piedmont. Gioberti drafted a new programme, *Del rinnovamento civile d'Italia* (1850), and preached to Savoy its duties in the leadership of Italy. The disastrous war had revealed deep-seated defects in the organization and administration of the state. They were now repaired. The army was reorganized by General la Marmora. The practical direction of the ministry was more and more manifestly assumed since 1850 by Count Camillo Benso di Cavour. He was destined to realize the programme of Savoy in brilliant fashion. To him most of all Italy owes its unity. He has often been compared with Bismarck. It is fairer to view him on his own merits. There are similarities. Both brought a nation to unity; both found their opponent in Austria. But the parallel fails in detail. The problems on both sides were too different to permit comparison. One might say that the task of Cavour was more complicated, more involved and subtle. There were too many factors and tangles with which he had to reckon, while for Bismarck his line of march was plainly marked out. In outward appearance certainly Cavour could bear no comparison with the Teutonic giant Bismarck. His figure was corpulent

and comfortable. One might take him for a shrewd lawyer. His little eyes twinkled slyly behind his glasses. His lips twitched with sarcasm. He was originally an officer, but soon engaged in politics and put his pen at the service of liberty. He had made use of the newly granted freedom of the press by publishing a newspaper *Risorgimento*, and in 1848 his paper had been the first to demand a constitution. Few equaled him in his appreciation of the importance of public opinion. He saw that national undertakings must have the masses behind them if they are to succeed; and the press was the instrument to create public opinion. His guiding idea at that time was: Whatever displeases Austria must necessarily please us. Austria disliked the idea of a modernized state of Piedmont; therefore Cavour built it. Ecclesiastical jurisdiction was abolished, and the way was paved for civil marriage; that is to say, the state became the sole administrator of law. Monastic property was confiscated in part. A railway was built from Turin to Genoa, and commerce began to develop. In 1857 the tunnel through Mount Cenis was begun, which made traffic between Germany and Italy possible. All this increased the power and importance of the little state. Here Italians saw their common hopes appreciated. Italian patriots drifted toward Turin. What the celebrated chemist, Justus von Liebig, said to Count Cavour began to be realized:

If in a mass of dead and amorphous matter there is only a single organized and living molecular force, that is enough to organize all the rest and revitalize it. It seems to me that this little country at the foot of the Alps is the living molecular force which is destined to overcome the power of death, and breathe new life and warmth into all the rest of Italy.

With the year 1855 Piedmont emerged from the quiet of its preparation. It participated in the Crimean war against Russia as the ally of England, France, and Turkey. The military success was moderate, the diplomatic success was immense. For the first time little Piedmont had raised its voice in the concert of the great European nations. Cavour was able to force a discussion of the Italian question in the negotiations of the Congress of Paris. At last that question had ceased to be treated as the fantastic dream of revolutionary leagues. It had begun to engage the attention of the powers. Especially Napoleon had begun to consider the prob-

lem which was destined to become classic: *Que peut-on faire pour l'Italie?*

The liaison between France and Italy now began. Cavour joyfully seized the hand stretched out to him, for only with the help of allies could he hope to win his game against Austria. The emperor of the French was actuated by various motives. He loved Italy, the ancestral home of his dynasty. At the beginning of the thirties he had himself fought in the service of Italian liberty. He had felt, to his cost, the angry passions of Italian patriotism when Felice Orsini in 1858 attempted to assassinate him because he had appeared to betray the hopes of Italy. Even stronger than these personal interests were the political motives. Was it not possible to withdraw Italy from the influences of Austria and make it a client of France? Might he not extort Savoy and Nizza as a price for the help thus given? Napoleon knew that he could charge the maximum price, because his aid was indispensable. Would that not signify a brilliant success of France on the Mediterranean? If he became the champion of Italy, could he not pose as the leader of the Latin nations and the champion of the modern principle of nationality? And would not such achievements unite in strengthening the foundations of the imperial throne in France, which was badly in need of strengthening?

In the summer of 1858 the emperor of the French and the Italian prime minister met in the watering place Plombières. They went driving together; Napoleon himself did the driving; and here the Franco-Sardinian alliance was arranged which was to have such profound consequences. Its political aim was: Italy free to the Adriatic! That is to say, Lombardy and Venice were to be united with Sardinia. That was the limit of the scheme for the present. Cavour had no idea as yet of uniting the whole of Italy in one state. His aim was simply a federation of states in which Sardinia would play the leading rôle. As a price of his aid Napoleon demanded Savoy and Nizza.

The alliance was kept strictly secret. It meant war with Austria. At the New Year's reception of the diplomatic corps in 1859 Napoleon publicly announced the war. The solemn engagement of the oldest daughter of Victor Emmanuel, the princess Clothilde, with the cousin of the emperor, prince Jerome, was the seal of the alliance. Piedmont mobilized its troops. In addition to the regular army, volun-

teer corps were formed. Garibaldi undertook their command. He, if anyone, could make the battle for liberty popular. The enlistments were immense; glowing enthusiasm raised the banners and sang the hymn of Garibaldi:

Uplifted the tombstones! Our martyrs arisen!
Brave Italy's bravest have leaped from death's prison!
Fair bays on each forehead, each hand with its steel,
Hearts beating and burning for Italy's weal.
Up, up, O my brothers, and chase from our land
The foeman, the alien, with sword and with brand!
Wave, wave your bright banners, the while glad and high
Throb hearts that so proudly for Italy die!

The allies marched victoriously from Magenta to Milan, from Solferino to Peschiera. But suddenly Napoleon turned about and made peace. It was arranged at Villafranca and concluded at Zürich. This was an evident discomfiture for Sardinia. The political aim of "Italy free to the Adriatic" was reduced to "Italy free to the Mincio." Venice remained in the hands of Austria. Lombardy alone fell to Italy, and the heavy price of Savoy and Nizza had to be paid to France, whereby the Sardinian dynasty lost its ancestral country. In view of this turn of affairs Cavour resigned. "Alliances are good; our own strength is better." But even the intensest development of Italian forces could not cope with Austria. Napoleon's sudden turn was possibly due to a fit of temper. The physical illness which was troubling him at that time had made him irritable. And at bottom he was secretly afraid that he would lose his controlling influence over Sardinia if Italy really became free to the Adriatic. But that controlling influence he was determined to maintain, whatever happened.

But even now the force of idealism in the movement for unity was to triumph over the selfishness of practical politics. In the Peace of Zürich it had been stipulated that Parma, Toscana, Modena, and the Romagna—that is, the territories adjacent to Lombardy—were to have autonomy in their own affairs. These territories of middle Italy now unanimously determined to unite with Piedmont. Napoleon suffered them to do so. Austria was too busy in Hungary to object. Thus, in spite of Villafranca and Zürich, the movement for unity had scored a magnificent success.

"In politics it is never wise to have more than one aim at a time. Our present task is solely to consider how we can eliminate Austria from Italy," said Cavour, before the beginning of the war. In a temporary fashion this task was now accomplished; not yet finally. The question of Naples and Sicily became acute. Now that the north and the middle of Italy were united, attention turned to the south. In 1859 King Ferdinand of Naples died. He was an ultra-reactionary. In the revolutionary year of 1848 he had re-established his government by bombs, and hence the people called him *Re Bomba*, and his son, who succeeded his father, *Re Bombicello*. Possibly the granting of a constitution would have saved his throne. When he refused it, the revolution broke out in 1860, fanned by the Mazzinists and led by Garibaldi. Francesca Crispi, the late premier, was among those who took arms. Cavour, who was prime minister once more, entered into relations with this revolutionary movement, but secretly, in order not to offend France, which was negotiating with the Papal State. Garibaldi was covertly encouraged and used in order to cut loose the former kingdom of Naples and Sicily from the reactionary party, and to bring it in touch with Piedmont. But affairs moved with unexpected rapidity. "The March of the Thousand," of the brave little band led by Garibaldi, was so brilliantly successful that any restoration of Bourbon rule was out of the question. The people demanded union with Piedmont. But Garibaldi and the Mazzinists aimed for more. The Sicilian revolution was the work of the radical wing in the movement for unity, of the revolutionists and demagogues who were not content with the slow diplomacy of Cavour and refused to stop short with the annexation of Naples and Sicily. They proposed to overthrow the Papal State and thus with one blow complete the unity of Italy. It was to be either a republic, or a monarchy under the sovereignty of Piedmont; on this point they were not as one. Cavour was thus in the unpleasant position of Goethe's *Zauberlehrling*; but at the right moment he succeeded in gaining control of the unruly spirits. Just when Garibaldi was on the point of invading the Papal State, Cavour marched the army of Sardinia into the Papal State and on against Naples. Thus the initiative was wrested from Garibaldi, and his part was played out. Sicily and Naples fell to Piedmont. He returned to his rocky island

of Caprera. He was not even made governor-general of Naples, though during the revolution he had been dictator of Sicily. In masterly fashion Cavour had succeeded in getting the revolutionists and republicans to pull the chestnuts out of the fire and in pocketing the gain, nearly the whole of southern Italy, for Sardinia. Sardinia-Piedmont, firmly established in the north, the south, and the center of the peninsula, was now constituted as the kingdom of Italy in 1861.

Thus one more task had been splendidly solved. Two more remained: to conquer Venice and to absorb the Papal State. The latter was the more difficult, but it could not be avoided. Quite apart from the fact that an ecclesiastical state in the midst of modern political life was an anachronism, the Papal State had forfeited its right to existence by its internal rottenness. Its financial management was the most dilapidated that can be imagined. Brigandage was so organized that bandits could venture to appear on the stage of a theater during the performance and hold up the audience. Moreover, a united Italy without Rome was unthinkable. Past history demanded this center, and contemporary idealism joined the demand. Cavour justly said: "Without Rome as capital Italy cannot be constituted. Rome unites all historical, intellectual, and moral conditions for the capital of a great state. The entire nation demands Rome as its capital." But as a practical politician he added: "We can get to Rome only under two conditions: first, we must have the acquiescence of France; second, the capture of Rome must not be the signal for the captivity of the church." But how were these conditions to be fulfilled? Overtures were made to the Papal State, but every thought of an Italian occupation of Rome was sternly repudiated. The consent of France also was not forthcoming. Napoleon could not do more than he had done, nor did he mean to do more. He did not mean to do more for the leadership in the movement for Italian unity would slip away from him if there were no more unsolved problems in Italy which brought him to the front as the decisive factor. If Italy were completely united, it was likely to be restive under his interference. Neither could he do more, for his throne rested on the balance of political parties in France, and the most powerful of parties was the clerical. It was out of the question for him to lend a hand toward the conquest of the Papal State. But

as long as these two conditions were unfulfilled, the Roman question was insoluble. Under the pressure of this situation, Italy was even compelled to punish an invasion of the Papal State attempted by Garibaldi, by the arrest of the leader on the heights of Aspromonte.

Now that little more was to be expected of France, we understand how it was that the eyes of Italy turned to another state which was also striving toward unity under similar conditions, namely Prussia. As early as 1858 Cavour had prophesied: "Prussia will inevitably be drawn into the sphere of the German national idea. The alliance of Prussia with the larger Piedmont is written in the book of the future." He was not to see the fulfilment of his prophecy. He died in 1861; in 1866 the alliance of the two powers was consummated. The common opposition to Austria cemented it. And now the jealousy of the great powers was to aid little Italy in curious ways. When war broke out between Prussia and Austria in 1866, Napoleon counted on the victory of Austria. But if Austria was victorious, the pre-eminence of France in European politics was threatened. In order to prevent this and to make the weight of his authority felt, Napoleon made an arrangement with Austria on the following basis: Austria was to cede Venice, whatever might be the outcome of the war; Austria was to resign the hegemony of Germany; in return for this France would remain neutral during the war and would protect the Papal State. In consequence of this play of interests among the powers, Italy was safe-guarded whatever the outcome might be. It stood to win in any case. This explains the curious fact that, in spite of the defeat of the Italians by land at Custoza and by sea at Lissa, Venice was ceded to Napoleon according to the treaty, and was then united by plebiscite with Italy. That solved the Venetian question.

Four years more were to pass before the last and most difficult part of the great work of unification was accomplished—the solution of the Roman question. When Prussia achieved its victory over Austria, the Franco-Prussian war was only a question of time. As early as 1866 it had been thought of in Paris. For Italy the difficult problem now arose: To whose fortunes should it ally itself in this impending conflict? Neutrality was out of the question for a state whose fortunes could be advanced only by taking sides. The sym-

pathies of Italy more and more plainly began to turn toward Prussia, since France remained inexorable on the Roman question. In the convention of September, 1864, Italy had been compelled to concede the protection of the Papal State, and had made Florence its capital in public testimony of the fact that Rome was no longer considered. Another insurrection, led by Garibaldi and fomented by Italy, had failed. French bullets had scattered his bands at Mentana. Italy again was compelled to arrest him. Had not France by this time forfeited all claims to the gratitude of Italy for Solferino? On the other hand, loud acclamations greeted the Prussian crown prince when he visited Florence in 1868 for the marriage of Crown Prince Umberto. Nevertheless, Napoleon, putting his trust in the amiability of Victor Emmanuel, hoped to achieve an alliance. Diplomatic negotiations began. But at the same moment Bismarck dug a counter-mine. As soon as an alliance should be perfected between Italy and France, Mazzini was to raise the banner of the Italian republic, and thus hold the royal troops in check. A masterly bit of diplomacy! But before the mine could explode, the Prussian troops had decided the future. The Roman question thwarted any union of interest between France and Italy. When one battle after the other was lost by Napoleon, and when his entire empire collapsed at Sedan, Victor Emmanuel with swift resolve commanded his troops to advance. On September 20, 1870, they entered Rome by the Porta Pia; it has since been called *Porta di Vicesimi Settembre*. "In Rome we are, in Rome we stay," were the words of the king when he solemnly entered on July 2, 1871. *Roma intangibile* became the watchword. The unity of Italy was complete. Rome was its capital.

We are at the end of a long and devious course. Italy did not travel it unaided. It had to work its way up amid the play and counterplay of interests among the powers. It was like a block of wood, which is pressed from the right and the left, and thus is forced forward. Its merit was that it exposed the proper surface to the pressure at the proper moment.

With remarkable rapidity the modern state of Italy has won its place. North and south have joined their forces, though differing widely in the character of their people and their historical development; the south, the soil for the revolutionists; the north, owing to

the long Austrian occupation, conservative in its spirit. Only when the cry of social distress sounds too piercingly from Sicily and receives no answer, do the old antagonisms awake, and Camorra and Mafia leap into new life. The strongest bond of unity is the monarchy. The royal family is popular. The people know how it has served the country. The memory of Victor Emmanuel, a charming personality and a gallant cavalier toward the fair ones of his country still lives in the heart of his people. Anecdotes and jokes, which if not true, are at least well invented, still circulate about him, and the son and grandson have inherited this sympathy. The two queens at present are even more popular, Margherita and Elena; the former highly cultured, with all the pluck of the new woman, a bold Alpine climber and autoist; the latter, in gentler womanly charm, surrounded with a certain romantic glamor as the daughter of the prince of the Black Mountains. The dynasty understands how to coin this treasure of popular love. The king is often among the people, especially when his people are in need. And royal help in the hour of trouble is remembered by the heart of the nation. In 1883 King Umberto personally visited the cholera hospitals and brought comfort and help to the sick. In the same way Victor Emmanuel III after the destruction of the recent earthquake personally directed the salvage work. One of the first acts of his reign was to grant support to the agricultural colony in the delta of the Tiber, which is to drain and utilize that swampy and fever-breeding tract. The crown cordially supports ideal purposes tending to strengthen and intensify the national consciousness. It has published the works of Mazzini at public expense, although this revolutionist was by no means a friend of the monarchy. But he was a factor in the movement for unity as well as Garibaldi, whose monument looks down on the city of Rome as guardian of the Capitol.

We in Germany always greet with satisfaction any return of the government to the maxims of Bismarck. Italy has remained even more faithful to the course mapped out by its great minister, Cavour. The understanding with Prussia initiated by him has taken enduring form in the alliance with Germany, and to Austria he said: "When the cause of our hostility is removed, we shall yet become good friends." But the people are not nearly so content with the Austrian alliance

as with the German. Certain circles, that stand by the motto *Italia irredenta*, have not yet become resigned to the fact that the southern Tyrol and Istria have been cut off from the body of the unified peninsula. The recent student riots at Innsbruck testify to that. On the other hand, the wound torn by the loss of Nizza and Savoy has healed. The old followers of Garibaldi who, like their master, could not forget it, have died out. When France openly courts the favor of Italy, the people at least are not backward in responding.

The Italian army has risen to the task which the Triple Alliance has set for it. The regular army of seven hundred thousand and the reserves of about three hundred and fifty thousand men are well trained. The cavalry is splendidly drilled for work on difficult territory. And the pets of the Italians, the handsome Bersaglieri with their waving feather crests and their guns carried horizontally in hand, are famous for their magnificent marching capacity. With the exception of battleships of the second and third class, in which the fleet is poor, both artillery and navy are in fair condition. The efficiency of the army is not to be judged by the disastrous outcome of Italian colonial schemes in Africa. If a single general, Baratieri, blundered, he is not the entire army. Other generals and officers, in spite of the crushing defeat at Adna, have rendered eminent service.

Industry and commerce have developed remarkably in Italy and are competing in importance with agriculture. Textile industry in silk and wool, and in the spinning and weaving of cotton, has shared in the modern development toward manufacturing on a large scale, though cottage industries, like spinning and straw-braiding, persist more tenaciously than with us. The Italian production of silk has been estimated as one-sixth of the total production of the world. Imports have decreased decidedly. A national industry has been created.

Remarkable work has been done by the young state in popular and scientific education. As long as the reactionary forces ruled, educational conditions were wretched. Since 1877 elementary education has been obligatory. There is no parish in Italy without its public school. Special stress is laid on instruction in history. The child is to be proudly conscious of belonging to a respected and power-

ful nation. It is to feel that it is a descendent of the ancient Romans. Thus pride in their ancient inheritance is early implanted in the soul of the young. Corporal punishment is unknown; appeal is made to the child's pride and sense of honor when it transgresses. Secondary schools, gymnasia, and universities—there are twenty-one of the latter—are highly developed. The girls share in their instruction. The University of Naples has more than five thousand students. Laboratories and libraries, at least at the larger universities, are well equipped. The reputation of Italian learning is crossing the Alps. Not to speak of poets and literary artists, such names as those of the great criminal psychologist Cesare Lombroso, of the historian Villari, of the political economist Messedaglia, have a wide reputation.

In short, with surprising rapidity the young nation has bent to its task and carried it to success. Italy had its era of wild speculation in the eighties, just as Germany did in the seventies. But that has been overcome. Only the ruins of those immense palaces, teeming with the proletariat, described in Zola's *Rome*, testify to that time of speculative intoxication. The Italian state has won its place in history. It is strong toward the outer world, and a well-organized body in its inner life is ready even to furnish its foreign visitors with aesthetic and social pleasures.

And yet a certain largeness and stability are still lacking to the Italian state. It seems impossible to form far-seeing plans. The state lives from hand to mouth. The social question is fearfully pressing. The antagonism between city and country, between rich and poor, is remarkably accentuated. The state has a colossal burden of debt, in part adopted with the absorption of the constituent states. To pay the interest indirect taxes are levied on the most indispensable articles of food, like salt and sugar. The administrative organization was copied from France, and is exceedingly cumbersome. Yet nothing is done to strike at the root of the evil by any radical measures. If the populace in Sicily is too turbulent, its mouth is stopped for a while by a grant of money, or its cries are silenced by military force; but that does not solve the social question, which still clamors for solution. The same incapacity holds in the educational system, in the problem of providing the agricultural

laborer with fair conditions of life; in short, in all domains of political interest. There is a lack of large and determined planning.

The cause for this deep-seated inability is Italian parliamentarism. The ministry is dependent on a majority in the Chamber of Deputies. The Chamber of Senators, whose members are appointed for life by the king, is comparatively without influence. And in the election for the Chamber of Deputies the national concerns and duties are overshadowed by personal interests. Few nations are so deeply excited by their elections as the Italian. All the intensity of the southerner is brought into play. Houses, corners, walls, are covered with proclamations to the voters, often in the most screaming words and colors; but it is much ado about little. The personal advancement of the candidates is the real issue. We find a candidate soliciting the votes of the rifle clubs by promising state aid for rifle matches. But what can a parliament do for the welfare of the country when its members are concerned solely about personal issues? Hence the Italian Chamber is constantly hot with personal frictions. The oratorical duel between Felice Cavallotti and Crispi was typical. Thus the fundamental condition is lacking for any far-seeing national activity. And how can the ministers guide the representatives of the people toward larger plans, when they themselves are liable to be dismissed by a single adverse vote of the Chamber? Every guarantee is lacking for the execution of any large problems which may be undertaken. The ministers themselves count on the shortness of their official terms, for they reserve their right to return to their previous positions. To make the measure of trouble full, all the subordinate officials change with every change of the ministry, and every head of a department has to create his department anew. When a minister resigns in Prussia (and that is not very rare at present), the secret councilor still remains—the *Geheimrat*, who has grown gray in the civil service, and, as the Berlin political economist Schmoller recently said, playfully but truthfully, “the *Geheimrat* trains his minister.” The stability of the subordinate civil officers guarantees the stability of the administration in spite of changes in the ministry.

This parliamentarism in Italy is not really constitutional. According to the constitution the ministers are responsible to the crown

alone, but parliamentarism has grown up by usage in a state in which the transition from autocracy to democracy came about somewhat too hurriedly.

Whether the crown will avail itself of its constitutional rights to remedy this fundamental evil is more than doubtful. A usage of thirty-five years' standing acquires a great power of inertia, and Victor Emmanuel III at present does not seem to be willing to emerge from his political retirement. But recently a new vista has opened toward the future through portals that hitherto seemed hermetically closed to all that concerned the Italian state: the portals of Rome, of the Vatican, of Pius X.

The attitude which Italian politics ought to assume toward the church was laid down by Cavour. He considered it the great historical task to conciliate the pope in favor of united Italy. He believed that the problem was to be solved on the basis of a free church in a free state. To each its own; to the state, the political sphere, without limitation; to the church, the ecclesiastical sphere, equally without limitation. Cavour, without ever flinching, stood for this division of interests; *libra chiesa in stato libero*, were his last words. It was the ecclesiastical and political ideal of liberalism. Exactly the same ideal prevailed in Germany in 1848. The earlier idea of a state granting equality to all religions had advanced to the idea of a state neutral in all affairs of religion. The example of Belgium and the ideas of Lamennais had influenced Cavour. He firmly believed in the possibility of carrying out this scheme. He hardly feared any contradiction, and in touching simplicity he was convinced that, if the nation came before the pope and said to him, "Holy Father, temporal power is no longer a guarantee of your independence; be pleased to surrender it and we will give you the true liberty," the pope would obey the voice of the nation. Italy was sadly disenchanted if these were its hopes. We today, undazzled by the ideas of liberalism and trained by history, would say that the disenchantment was inevitable. Every office has its official spirit, and the official spirit of the Curia has been formed for centuries. Its conviction was: To the pope belongs the sovereignty of the world; the tangible proof of it is his sovereignty over the Papal State. To surrender that voluntarily would have meant to surrender principles

and a surrender of principles is impossible for the church which claims to be unchangeable. Thus the consistent *non possumus* of the pope was very comprehensible. But thereby Cavour's ecclesiastical policy was given a fatal turn; its actual outcome was so different from the scheme as planned. The spheres of church and state were indeed separated. The state simply demanded obedience to its laws from its clerical citizens as from others. But this was not such a separation of functions as still aims at a higher organic unity in the common work for the welfare of Italy. That had been the hope of Cavour's idealism. The actual result was rather a sharp separation of two forces which clash in constant antagonism, and Italy pays the costs of the quarrel. The Italian state is neutral in religion; it provides no religious instruction in the schools. Wherever there is such instruction, it has been smuggled in. The clergy are not eligible for civil office. The universities have no theological faculties. The church is a world by itself, and so is the state, and the sharp antagonism between these two worlds forbids any friendly interchange. Religion is an affair of the individual. Nationalists, on account of the hostility between Vatican and Quirinal, even regard it as a matter of honor to have no religion. As a result we have the peculiar stratification of the people: among the intellectual élite of the people, skepticism; among the mass, bigoted religion. A healthy, open-eyed enjoyment of religion is lacking. At the Congress of Free-thinkers, at the dedication of the monument of Giordano Bruno, during the visit of Ernst Haeckel at Rome, these hostile extremes collided and exploded. Thus it was under Pio Nono; thus under Leo XIII.

But now under Pius X, the former Cardinal Sarto, a new master has ascended the papal throne. Public opinion in Italy at once took a lively and unexpected interest in him. He was elected as a compromise candidate on account of Austria's objection to the intransigent candidate, Rampolla. He seemed to be a harmless man, as compromise candidates usually are, and likely to devote himself to charitable and social activity, in which he had been very diligent in his see at Venice. But soon the rumor spread: Pius X is seeking conciliation with the Italian state. The rumor became more and more concrete. We can now assert with fair certainty that negotia-

tions have been opened. Whether they will succeed, who knows? It is a fact that in the summer of 1904 Queen Margherita met the pope at the Vatican. It is a fact that Pius X has withdrawn financial support from the newspaper *Voce della verita*, and thereby compelled it to suspend publication, because it stood for the irreconcilable attitude. It is a fact that in 1904 for the first time an Italian bishop, the archbishop of Bologna, acting on instructions from Rome, participated in a festival of the king at Bologna and was received by Victor Emmanuel with distinguished honors. It is a fact that the father confessor of Queen Margherita, Monsignore Bonomelli, whom public opinion regards as the author of the touching prayer which the widow offered on behalf of her assassinated husband, is in high favor with Pius X. It is a fact that Pius X not only tolerates but demands the civil marriage of the state to be performed before the marriage is consecrated by the church. The public consummation of all these facts was the papal breve of June 11, 1905, which not only permitted but recommended the clergy to take part in the parliamentary elections. Leo XIII had still insisted on the prohibition of participation in the classic phrase, *non expedit*. It is true that the pope immediately modified his permission, but there was no intention to disavow it. The modification was simply an indication that the negotiations between Quirinal and Vatican are still unfinished. How they will end we do not know. The Curia will demand that the sovereignty of the pope be recognized; or rather that it be guaranteed; for since the laws of 1871 the pope has sovereignty, even though he has no territory. Italy at that time also allowed him an annual grant of \$800,000. Hitherto he has refused to touch it, and has lived on Peter's pence. The question is often discussed whether the Curia will demand the entire sum with interest compounded for thirty-five years, or whether the claim is outlawed by lapse of time. The Curia realizes that the international position of the papacy has steadily improved since the Papal State has been lost. Catholics in Germany have so far shared this realization that of late they have refrained from adopting any resolution in favor of the restoration of the temporal power; they are content with an elastic demand for the sovereignty and independence of the pope. Now Cavour's idea begins to be appreciated: "The pope will be more independent and

will exercise his sacred office more effectively after he has resigned the temporal power and has made a lasting peace with Italy on the basis of liberty."

For Italy the reconciliation of church and state would be a blessing. Only then could religion become an integral factor in popular education and culture. It is possible only in this way. Italy is bound to Catholicism; it cannot become Protestant. The success of Protestant missions, even of the faithful work of the Waldenses, is slight, and the leader of the Old-Catholic movement, Count Campello, shortly before his death laid down his arms and submitted to the church. The Latin race, the Italian people, with their southern vivacity, with their inborn instinct for splendor and glitter, where the poorest peasant decks his little donkey with a gay head-dress, cannot conform to Protestant austerity. The Italian loves churches in which candles are gleaming and clouds of incense rising; where the bright vestments of the priests fascinate his attention; where little dramas, Christmas plays, or the bambino presented in the temple exhibit action and evoke emotion. He loves to see the Holy Father borne on his throne over the heads of the people in St. Peter's with clapping of hands and shouts of *Evviva*. Thus only the Vatican can heal the breach between culture and religion.

In parliament the participation of strenuous Catholics at the elections will create a clerical party. This will at any rate infuse fresh blood into the Chamber. It is true the clerical party may become hostile to the state. It may make ultramontane demands with which the state cannot comply. But even then this new life will stimulate. The friction created may kindle the fire of progress; for large aims and principles will inevitably come under discussion when a power is represented which claims to rule the world. These large aims have hitherto been lacking. Italy will have to become mindful of its higher destiny and rise above the narrowness of personal interests. Her greater tasks will be taken in hand, and thus possibly through clericalism, or in spite of clericalism, the fundamental evil of Italy, parliamentarism, will be overcome.

Castles in the air? Certainly. Possibly they will remain such. The state and the church, Quirinal and Vatican, have not yet concluded their treaty of peace. The pope has not yet left his "prison,"

as it used to be called, and shown himself on soil belonging to the government. But his country palace, Castelgandolfo, has been repaired and is awaiting its master. His cardinal secretary of state has already made his inspection there. If peace is concluded, and if affairs develop along the lines we have traced, then Italy will owe thanks, not only to its king, whom it passionately loves, but to its pope, to whom it looks up in awe and veneration. Then Cavour's great aim will have been attained, even though it be only in the form of an opposition party: the Church will be an organic part of the State. That would be the capstone in the edifice of united Italy.